



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

as good a cause of action as where malice is present. But late American cases are opposed to the English doctrine. *Brown Hardware Co. v. Ind. Stove Works* (1902), —Tex. Civ. App.—, 69 S. W. Rep. 805; 1 MICHIGAN LAW REV. 333.

MINERS AND MINING—EXTRALATERAL RIGHTS—DEEDS—CONSTRUCTION.—The owner of two adjoining mining claims deeded to plaintiff an irregularly shaped portion of one of them with end lines not parallel to those of the original claim and described as a part of the "Johnstown quartz lode mining claim." Later he granted to the defendant all his interest in the remainder of this and the adjoining claim. In a suit to enjoin defendant's trespass. *Held*, that the injunction should be granted. *Montana, etc. Co. v. Boston, etc. Co.*, (1902), — Mont. —, 70 Pac. R. 1114.

The court says: "In determining the effect of these conveyances regard must be had . . . to the character of the property granted . . . The deed (plaintiff's) omits any reference to the veins or the dips, spurs, angles thereof but it is apparent therefrom that the parties were dealing with the property as quartz mining property, that is a definite portion of the 'Johnstown quartz lode mining claim.'" Hence the conclusion was that the plaintiff was entitled to extralateral rights as to all veins having their apices within the end lines of the conveyed portion; and that such rights were bounded by planes drawn parallel to the end lines of the original location, passing through the points where such veins cross the end lines of the portion conveyed. Plaintiff in support of his claim cited *Boston etc. Co. v. Montana Co.*, 89 Fed. R. 529. In this case Judge De Haven, construing the same deed, held that plaintiff's extralateral rights were bounded by planes parallel to the actual end lines of the conveyed portion, which diverged from each other on the dip of the vein, thus giving plaintiff much greater rights. He cited in support of his position *Richmond Min. Co. v. Eureka Min. Co.*, 103 U. S. 839; *Eureka Min. Co. v. Richmond Mining Co.*, 8 Fed. Cases 819, 4 Sawy. 302; *Stinchfield v. Gillis*, 107 Cal 86, 40 Pac. R. 98. But in none of these cases was this point involved.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS—CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—TAXES AND LICENSES.—Mandamus to compel the treasurer of the city of Auburn to place certain funds, collected by the city under an ordinance, at the disposal of the officers of the Auburn school district. The question for the court to determine was whether the moneys collected were license moneys within the meaning of Art. VIII., Sec. 6, of the constitution of Nebraska, which provided, "All such fines, penalties and license moneys shall be appropriated exclusively to the use and support of common schools in the respective subdivisions where the same may accrue." *Held*, that the moneys collected were taxes and the mandamus proceedings were dismissed. *State ex rel. Auburn School District v. Boyd* (1902), — Neb. —, 89 N. W. Rep. 416, 58 L. R. A. 108.

The object of the ordinance was to impose "an occupation tax on certain occupations or business." By one section it was unlawful for any person to engage in certain occupations or business, until he had paid the tax and the same was evidenced by a receipt. Another section provided for penalties for the violation of the ordinance. The majority of the court argued that inasmuch as it was clearly the intention to exercise the taxing power and as the municipality had such power, the imposition was a tax, even though the payment of the tax was made a condition precedent to the right to engage in these occupations. They also contended that as the city charter provided for the enforcement of ordinances by fines and other punishments, the section pertaining to penalties was valid. In his minority opinion Judge Holcomb asserted that, by a proper construction of the form as well as the substance of